



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,179	06/19/2001	Gen-ichiro Soma	209956US0XPC	8977

22850 7590 09/30/2003

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

GRUN, JAMES LESLIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1641

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/857,179

Applicant(s)  
SOMA

Examiner  
James L. Grun, Ph.D.

Art Unit  
1641



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 4, 5, 6 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1641

To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Technology Center 1600, Group 1640, Art Unit 1641.

Claims 5-11 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). These claims have been further treated on the merits as if dependent upon claim 1.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification is objected to under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention, and failing to adequately teach how to make and/or use the invention, i.e. failing to provide an enabling disclosure.

The specification is objected to and claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to provide an adequate written description of the invention and failing to provide an enabling disclosure, because the specification does not provide evidence that the claimed biological materials are: (1) known and readily available to the public; (2) reproducible from the written description; or, (3) deposited in compliance with the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.801-1.809.

Art Unit: 1641

It is unclear if the cell line which produces antibodies having the exact chemical identity and properties of the antibodies designated CMU-1, FERM BP-6870, is known and publicly available, or can be reproducibly isolated without undue experimentation. Accordingly, filing of evidence of the reproducible production of the cell line and antibodies necessary to practice the instant invention or filing of evidence of deposit is required. Without a publicly available deposit of the above cell line, one of skill in the art could not be assured of the ability to practice the invention as claimed. Exact replication of: the claimed cell line; the cell line which produces the chemically and functionally distinct antibodies claimed; and/or, the claimed antibody's amino acid or nucleic acid sequence is an unpredictable event. For example, very different  $V_H$  chains can combine with the same  $V_L$  chain to produce antibody binding sites with nearly the same size, shape, antigen specificity, and affinity. A similar phenomenon can also occur when different  $V_H$  sequences combine with different  $V_L$  sequences to produce antibodies with very similar properties. These observations indicate that divergent variable region sequences, both in and out of complementarity-determining regions, can be folded to form similar binding site contours, which result in similar immunochemical characteristics. Therefore, it would require undue experimentation to reproduce the claimed monoclonal antibody species chemically as produced by the hybridoma designated FERM BP-6870. A suitable deposit of the hybridomas would satisfy the enablement requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. See the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.801-1.809.

Art Unit: 1641

If the deposits are made under the terms of the Budapest Treaty, then an affidavit or declaration by Applicant, or a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, stating that the specific biological materials have been deposited under the Budapest Treaty, that the biological materials will be irrevocably and without restriction or condition released to the public upon the issuance of a patent and that the biological materials will be replaced should they ever become non-viable, would satisfy the deposit requirement made herein.

If the deposits have not been made under the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposits meet the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §§ 1.801-1.809, applicant may provide assurance of compliance by an affidavit or declaration, or by a statement by an attorney of record over his or her signature and registration number, showing that:

- (a ) during the pendency of this application, access to the invention will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;
- (b ) all restrictions upon availability to the public will be irrevocably removed upon granting of the patent;
- (c ) the deposits will be maintained in a public depository for a period of 30 years or 5 years after the last request or for the effective life of the patent, whichever is longer;
- (d ) the deposits were viable at the time of deposit; and,
- (e ) the deposits will be replaced if they should ever become non-viable.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 1-11, the relative terms “strongly”, “scarcely”, or “low” are vague and indefinite as to what levels of reacting are encompassed or excluded. Without a clear and unambiguous description and recitation of how one performs a comparison therefor and determines the requisite degree of reacting, the metes and bounds of the invention as instantly claimed cannot be determined.

Art Unit: 1641

In claims 2-8 and 11, "A" or "a" monoclonal antibody, as appropriate, should be --The-- or --the--, respectively, for proper antecedent support.

In claims 10 and 11, "a" diagnostic agent should be --the-- for proper antecedent support.

5 Claims 8, 10, and 11 provide for the use of a monoclonal antibody/diagnostic agent, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

10 Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

15 Claims 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

Art Unit: 1641

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.

5           Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) because the applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter. The reference of Honda et al (Clinica Chimica Acta 322: 59-66, 2002) provides evidence that plural inventors rather than a sole inventor is the inventive entity of the invention as instantly claimed. The reference has 5 co-authors, teaches the invention essentially as instantly disclosed and claimed, and indicates that "We established the first monoclonal  
10 antibody...[which] can be used to develop a simple screening assay for patients with dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase deficiency..." (see page 59).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

15           (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

20           (c) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more subsections (e), (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Art Unit: 1641

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Soma (WO 99/20748) in view of Hellstrom et al. (In MONOCLONAL ANTIBODIES FOR CANCER DETECTION AND THERAPY (Baldwin et al, eds.), Academic Press, London. p. 20, 1985).

5 Soma teaches methods as instantly disclosed for the elicitation of anti-uracil monoclonal antibodies for determination of uracil in urine of chemotherapy patients suspected of having dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase deficiency.

10 Hellstrom et al. teach (page 20) that the selection of hybridomas is dependent upon what one searches for and that "it is relatively easy to make additional monoclonal antibodies to an antigen that has already been identified (e.g. antibodies with different isotype and/or biological characteristics or with higher affinity). One can, for example, use the purified antigen for screening in binding assays..."

15 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the instant invention was made to have applied the teachings of Hellstrom et al., i.e. techniques to select alternative monoclonal antibodies to those already known for a given antigen, to the teachings of Soma to provide alternative anti-uracil monoclonal antibodies for use in the assays of Soma. One would have been motivated to provide additional antibodies to improve the specificity and detection limits of the assay for the target antigen by generation of antigen-specific antibodies of higher affinities than the single antibody exemplified by Soma.

20 Thus, the claimed invention as a whole was clearly prima facie obvious, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.



Art Unit: 1641

No claim is allowed.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Alarcón-Segovia et al. (Lancet, 1975) teaches autoantibodies in scleroderma patient sera  
5 specific for uracil.

Alarcón-Segovia et al. (Immunology 30: 413, 1976) teach the further characterization of the anti-uracil autoantibodies in scleroderma patient sera and disclose that methods were well known in the art for the elicitation of antibodies specific for purine and pyrimidine bases.

Uhlig et al. (Autoimmunity 5: 87, 1989) teach that it was known in the art to study the  
10 reactivities of patient autoantibodies by transforming B lymphocytes from the patients for the production of the autoantibodies as monoclonal antibodies.

Tsutsui et al. teach anti-thymine antibodies.


Art Unit: 1641


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James L. Grun, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 308-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

5 If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Long Le, SPE, can be contacted at (703) 305-3399.

The phone numbers for official facsimile transmitted communications to TC 1600, Group 1640, are (703) 872-9306, or (703) 305-3014, or (703) 308-4242. Official After Final communications, only, can be facsimile transmitted to (703) 872-9307.

10 Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196. The above inquiries, or requests to supply missing elements from Office communications, can also be directed to the TC 1600 Customer Service Office at phone numbers (703) 308-0197 or (703) 308-0198.

  
James L. Grun, Ph.D.  
September 29, 2003

  
CHRISTOPHER L. CHIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1800/641